

REMARKS

State of the Claims

Claims 1-14 are pending. Claim 3 has been canceled. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of now canceled Claim 3. No new matter has been added. Also, Claim 5 has been amended to now claim "filter material" rather than a "filter particle". Support for the amendment can be found in the specification at page 6, lines 24-27. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention.

The Examiner states that claim 5 is unclear because of a discrepancy between the claim language and the specification, most notably with Applicants' use of the term "screen" as it relates to filter fibers.

Claim 5 has been amended to remove the main term "particle" and replace it with the term --material-. Applicants now believe that Claim 5 is proper and is suitable to overcome the Examiner's rejection for indefiniteness.

Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 5 over the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-2 and 4-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Economy, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,834,114) in view of Buzzelli (U.S. Patent No. 3,650,834).

Applicants have amended Claim 1 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of now-canceled Claim 3. Applicants therefore believe that amended Claim 1, and all of the claims dependent therefrom, are allowable over the Examiner's obviousness rejection.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-2 and 4-12 over the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection.

Claims 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Economy '114, in view of Buzzelli '834 and further in view of Buelow, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,797).

Applicants note that Claims 13 and 14 depend from Claim 1. As noted hereinabove, Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of Claim 3. Claims 13 and 14 should therefore be held allowable over the Examiner's obviousness rejection.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 13 and 14 over the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection.

SUMMARY

The rejections in the Office Action have been discussed and, Applicants believe, the proper amendments have been set forth to address the rejections.

In light of both the amendments and the discussions contained herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection and its withdrawal.

Issuance of a Notice of Allowance at an early date is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL D. MITCHELL, ET AL.

By: 

Theodore P. Cummings, Esq.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 40,973
(513) 634-1906

November 3, 2003

Customer Number 27752